

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper  
for the guidance of teachers**

**9697 HISTORY**

**9697/13**

Paper 13, maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>13</b>

## GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Examiners will assess which Level of Response best reflects most of the answer. An answer will not be required to demonstrate all of the descriptions in a particular Level to qualify for a Mark Band.

In bands of 3 marks, examiners will normally award the middle mark, moderating it up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer. In bands of 2 marks, examiners should award the lower mark if an answer just deserves the band and the higher mark if the answer clearly deserves the band.

<b>Band</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Levels of Response</b>
1	21–25	The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material and ideas. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The best answers must be awarded 25 marks.
2	18–20	Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided.
3	16–17	Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.
4	14–15	Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively.
5	11–13	Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.
6	8–10	Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.
7	0–7	Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent. Marks at the bottom of this Band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answers usually make at least a few valid points.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	13

### SOURCE-BASED QUESTION: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

**'No country engaged in a war of aggression.' Use Sources A–E to show how far the evidence confirms this statement about the outbreak of World War I.**

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2–3]	EVALUATION [L4–5]	CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER (e.g. contextual knowledge)
A	Diplomatic report by the Belgian Ambassador to France.	N – Fears that French policy is determined by warlike politicians.	Y – The view is not by a Frenchman. It may be objective. Y – Belgium was more likely to be friendly to France than to Germany. But it sees France as a greater threat to peace. Y – It ignores other threats but sees France as the 'greatest' threat to peace.	Y – Confirmed briefly by E's reference to people rushing eagerly into war. N – No other Source refers to French policy.	N – reference might be made to the history of French grievances against Germany, especially since 1870–71 war. France would justify its policies as justified revenge not aggression. N – France was convinced of its military capacity in 1914. Y – France did not envisage the devastating effect of the Schlieffen Plan.
B	Diplomatic report by the Austrian Ambassador to Germany.	Y – Germany sees British policy as pacific. N – German officials are unanimous that Austria should take urgent and strong action against Serbia. Y/N – Germany is convinced that Russia is planning war and quick action is needed to prevent Russia becoming stronger. This can be seen as aggressive or defensive.	Y – There were real fears in Germany about Russia's growing military strength. Y – British policy was not clear until the outbreak of war. Y – Although written by a non-German, the Source sums up accurately the German position. Y – Austria saw its 'vital interests' at stake. N – Francis Joseph of Austria was not personally so determined on war as the Source claims.	Y – Source C agrees this view of Germany favouring an active policy by Austria that risks war. N – Source A sees France as the greatest danger to peace. N – Source E interprets German policy as one of threat and bluff rather than deliberate warmongering.	Y – Germany associated itself with Austria in the perception of a Slav threat (but there was little Slav threat to Germany itself). Y – Germany probably did not envisage a general war and wished to isolate Serbia. N – Reference might be made to other belligerent statements and policies from Germany, especially William II.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>13</b>

C	Message from a senior German minister to his ambassadors.	Y – Germany does not want war but self-interest means Austria must be supported. Y – Austria was defending itself and war might be a necessary last resort. N – Serbia was willing to risk war for its ambitions. N – Russia would be responsible if a local dispute spread to a European war.	Y – Serbia wished to head the Pan-Slavic movement in the early twentieth century. Y – The description of alliances is accurate. N – The involvement of the Serbian government and army in Sarajevo is not as clear-cut as the Source claims. N – Not only Russia was responsible when a general war broke out. N – The message was not objective but would be used to persuade other countries of the innocence of Germany and Austria.	Y – C agrees with B's view of German policy. N – Germany sees an immediate danger of Russian intervention whilst B believes it is a future danger. N – A presents another dimension: France. Not mentioned in C. N – The views in B and C are by allies. B might be thought more reliable whilst C is clearly offering a more subjective account of German policy.	Brief reference might be made to the Sarajevo event to confirm or deny the aims in C, for example about Serbian official involvement. The central role of Russia can be examined. However, whilst Serbia was ambitious, it is an exaggeration that its priority was to isolate Germany, although Germany was a powerful ally of Austria.
D	Official Russian government statement to Germany.	Y – Germany feels endangered by Russian mobilisation. N – The demand for an instant response seems unrealistic – but not impossible.	Y – It can be relied on inasmuch as the Source is an official statement. N – Official statements are not objective, especially in times of crisis.	Y – Source E sees Germany as one of the countries that did not want war. N – Source B shows a different Germany, a country that pushes Austria into action. N – Source C agrees with B and goes further to refer to opportunism.	Y – Russian mobilisation was an important danger to Germany. Y – Russia's intervention could bring in France and possibly Britain. N – The reasons for Russian mobilisation can be explained and might incriminate Germany.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>13</b>

E	Judgement of a modern British historian.	Y – The Source sees the war as caused by miscalculation. No country was aggressive and each defended its vital interests. (Even Belgium was a vital interest to Britain – not merely a moral commitment.) N – The account is generalised and does not include a consideration of alternatives.	Y – The Source has the value of an historian who is able to consider many sorts of evidence. Y – The extract is clearly and strongly argued. Y – The long and devastating nature of WWI was not predicted. N – Aggressive factors are ignored – but this is an overall summary of a complex issue.	Y – Source B: Britain was very reluctant to go to war. N – Source A sees France as aggressive. N – Source B: apart from the last sentence, Austria's policy is close to an aggressive Germany. Y/N – Russia is courting the danger of war by mobilising. Germany is not. But Germany issues an unrealistic ultimatum. Y/ N – Source C sees Germany as willing to go to war. But its intentions can be interpreted as defensive since it feared a greater threat in the future.	Y – In many ways, Europe stumbled into war. Mobilisation was probably the last and crucial factor. N – Politicians authorised mobilisation. N – Although there had been previous and resolved crises, Sarajevo was seen as more dramatic and dangerous. N – France was willing to exploit the Balkans crisis and Russia would not back down again.
---	--	---	---	--	---

**NB: These responses indicate only one way to analyse and evaluate the passages. Alternative arguments can be proposed, as long as they are soundly based.**

Key: Y & N, i.e. the source supports or challenges the hypothesis.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	13

## SECTION A: THE ORIGINS OF WORLD WAR I, 1870–1914

### THE OUTBREAK OF WORLD WAR I

#### 1 Source-Based Question

##### L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES [1–5]

These answers write generally about the causes of World War I with limited reference to the naval race but will ignore the key issues in the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. For example, they will not discuss 'No country engaged in a war of aggression' but might make only general points about the causes of the war. Included in this level are answers which use information taken from the sources but only in providing a summary of views expressed by the writers, rather than for testing the hypothesis.

##### L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6–8]

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context.

For example, 'The Sources agree with the claim that "No country engaged in a war of aggression". In Source B, the Austrian Ambassador reports that Germany fears that Russia would be able to wage war in the future and is not acting aggressively. Germany believed that Britain did not want to be drawn into a war. Source D indicates that Germany was on the defensive against Russian mobilisation. Source E believes completely that no country acted aggressively.'

Or, 'The Sources disagree with the claim that "No country engaged in a war of aggression". Source A indicates that France was very aggressive in 1914 and was "the greatest threat to peace". Source B shows that German policy was aggressive and that it urged Austria to be equally aggressive. Source C claims that Serbia was aggressive and that it was supported by Russia, who therefore was also aggressive.'

##### L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [9–13]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disconfirm it. However, sources are used only at face value.

For example, 'There is evidence for and against the claim that "No country engaged in a war of aggression". Source B indicates that Britain did not want war and that Russia was not prepared for hostilities. Source C claims that Austria and Germany were not aggressive. Source D claims that Germany did not welcome war. Source E argues that no country was aggressive and that war broke out by mistake. On the other hand, Source A describes French policy-makers as aggressive. Source B confirms that all of the authorities in Germany support action. Germany's willingness to take advantage of British and Russian policies shows that it was aggressive. Although Source C claims that Austria and Germany were not aggressive, Russia and especially Serbia were guilty of this charge. Source D's description shows Russia as being aggressive because it mobilised first. Source E makes out a case against aggression. Rather, politicians and civilians made miscalculations.'

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	13

L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE **OR** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [14–16]

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

For example, *'It is more accurate to conclude that the claim that "No country engaged in a war of aggression" is incorrect. Source A is valuable because it might be expected that Belgium would rely on French support more than Germany's but it makes a clear case that France was the greatest threat to European peace. There is no reference to France being threatened. The descriptions in Sources B and C of Germany's willingness to go to war and its encouragement of Austria to take firm action support each other and can also be supported by other knowledge. For example, the Schlieffen Plan was based on Germany taking action first in the west before embarking on a war against Russia. Both Source B and Source C are reliable in describing the views in them of William II and other major German politicians. The view of British policy in Source B is accurate. Britain did not make clear its willingness to go to war until very late in the post-Sarajevo crisis and then was involved because of the threat to Belgium, not to Serbia or Russia. Source E must be considered seriously as the judgement of a modern historian. It is correct that people did not predict the sort of war that was fought from 1914 to 1918 but the claim that countries – except Britain – only defended themselves is simplistic.'*

L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FIND EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE **AND** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [17–21]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

For example, (L4 plus) *'...On the other hand, Source A indicates that there were anti-war elements in France. Parts of Source B can be interpreted as showing that Germany feared a war with a stronger Russia in the future and was willing to engage in an early war. This can be confirmed by a study of spending on the military in Russia in the years before 1914. Whilst it ignores previous German aggressive policies, Source D is correct in claiming that Germany felt endangered by Russian mobilisation. Source E presents strong judgements about the causes of the war. However, although it is correct that no country imagined a long and ferocious war, it does not necessarily follow that countries went to war only for defensive reasons. Britain was motivated only by defensive reasons, although some German politicians claimed that Britain wished to weaken Germany as a military power. France wanted to overturn the result of the Franco-Prussian War. Russia wished to enlarge its influence in the Balkans by backing Serbia. Austria was anxious to prove that it was still a great power. Germany used the Serbian crisis to assert itself as the major military power in Europe.'*

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	13

- L6 AS L5, PLUS **EITHER** (a) EXPLAIN WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE/SUPPORT IS BETTER/PREFERRED, **OR** (b) RECONCILES/EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED. [22–25]  
 For (a), the argument must be that the evidence for challenging or supporting the claim is more justified. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but why some evidence is worse.

For example, *‘Although there is evidence in the Sources both to challenge and support the claim that no country engaged in a war of aggression, the more convincing case contradicts the claim. Source A shows French nationalism and militarism but France would not have gone to war without the support of Russia and hopefully Britain. With the other members of the Triple Entente behind it, France was willing to engage in war with Germany. Sources B and C are strong evidence for Germany’s willingness to go to war although it had no direct interests in the Balkans. Source D blames Russian mobilisation for the crisis. If true, it shows Russian aggressive intent and, if untrue, reveals Germany to have been responsible. Source E makes a strong case to support the claim but the politicians were ultimately responsible for making policy.*

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to modify the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it.

For example, *‘An alternative explanation is that the politicians of all countries made errors, especially about the nature of the war that would be fought. Almost all countries that go to war justify themselves by claiming that they were not aggressive but defending their vital interests. This was true of World War I but there were aggressive as well as defensive reasons. The most aggressive was Germany. Whilst Austria could claim that it was reacting to provocation from Serbia, Russia saw itself as the defender of the Slavs and Britain went to war on behalf of Belgium, Germany was not threatened by an invasion in 1914. Russia was arming itself but this was a future, not an immediate, danger.*



Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	13

## Section B

### 2 'The most important problem of the French ancien régime was poor quality leadership.' How far do you agree with this judgement?

The key issue is the problems of the ancien régime. Candidates need to address the stated claim about the lack of leadership by kings but can argue that other factors were more important. Louis XV (1715–74) and Louis XVI (1774–93 but the question ends in 1789) can be considered. Louis XV was amiable but idle, uninterested in matters of government and willing to concede to opponents of reform. Louis XVI was not as incompetent as he has often been portrayed but lacked the strength to introduce necessary changes. He was surrounded by reactionaries at court and in the provinces, perhaps most important Marie Antoinette, his wife. The French ancien régime needed a strong king because of its reliance on an absolute monarchy. Reference might also be made to economic and financial conditions – but how far were the kings responsible for these? The economy was potentially prosperous. France had many resources, a varied population and potential trade outlets but an unwillingness to change traditional practices caused problems. Investment in offices and land was more attractive, and more socially acceptable, than investment in manufacture and trade. Internal customs duties inhibited trade and therefore production. The fiscal system was inefficient. Tax farmers made great profits whilst exemptions meant that the most prosperous paid the least. It is untrue that the nobles and clergy paid nothing but the most onerous taxes, such as the taille, bore most heavily of the poor. On the other hand, changing most of these practices would have meant a virtual revolution in France. Tax farms represented investments whilst many profited from internal customs. The collection system itself was inefficient. On the other hand, the kings failed to back the reforming schemes of some controllers-general such as Turgot and Necker. The kings' control over many provinces was uncertain as intendants struggled to counter the influence of local nobles. The state lacked efficient institutions of government. The parliaments were notoriously reactionary, insistent on maintaining their privileges. Convening the Estates-General in 1789 was a sign of desperation following the refusal of the Assembly of Notable to countenance significant changes.

### 3 Assess the claim that the most important reason for the development of the Industrial Revolution in the nineteenth century was the contribution of capitalists. (You should refer to developments in at least two of Britain, France and Germany in your answer.)

The key issue is the role of capitalism in the Industrial Revolution. 'Assess the claim' means that candidates should examine the case for capitalism but are also invited to suggest and evaluate other factors. Capitalism involved money for investment, first by private individuals but more by banks and major financiers by the end of the nineteenth century. Candidates can argue that other factors were more important but marks in Bands 1 and 2 will normally require at least one sound paragraph on this topic. Britain had an advantage in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. There was sufficient money for investment in industrial projects and trade which took advantage of new developments. Although land was still important in Britain, there were more risk-takers in industry. In France and Germany, investments were still mostly in land. In France, offices were favoured until after the 1789 Revolution. Inventors such as Watt and Darby depended on financiers such as Boulton to exploit their inventions. Private investors were important to railways. Governments were slow to be involved. By the end of the century, individuals discovered the advantages of limited liability companies. Banks found industry profitable and there were more prosperous private financiers such as the Rothschilds. Candidates might consider a range of other factors such as the demands provided by growing populations, the implementation of new sources of power, especially steam, better communications and political conditions. In Germany, the Zollverein helped to change the German economy. It was also important politically but industrialisation only took off when Germany was unified. French industrialisation was held back until the second half of the nineteenth century by political instability. The later nineteenth century saw more changes,

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>13</b>

sometimes described as the Second Industrial Revolution. Chemicals, electricity and steel were responses to demands but also emerged because of capitalist investment. Candidates are not expected to have specific knowledge of non-industrialised countries in the nineteenth century but appropriate references to show contrasts should be rewarded.

#### **4 Why was it that Prussia unified Germany?**

The key issue is the reasons for the importance of Prussia in German unification. A key discriminating factor for marks in Bands 1 and 2 will be the ability to go beyond Bismarck's role. It can hardly be denied that his contribution was vital but Bismarck alone will not take candidates to the highest marks. On the other hand, answers in Band 1 can examine the other factors reasonably briefly if they argue that his role was decisive. Before Bismarck, Prussia had already established its importance as the best hope of those who wished to unify Germany. It was the only German state with a significant army (but not considered equal to Austria's). Its economy was more advanced and the Zollverein played an important part not only economically but also in giving Prussia political precedence. The 1848 Revolution was a failure. Frederick William IV refused the offer of the German crown from the abortive Frankfurt Parliament. William I was not radical but he opposed Austrian power in Germany. From 1862, Bismarck's role became more important but reference might be made to the work of Moltke and Roon. Bismarck's contribution should best be explained rather than narrated although examiners will not underestimate descriptions that make valid points en route. Diplomacy allowed him to make an ally of Austria whilst the lenient Peace of Prague (1866) meant that Austria was not permanently alienated from Prussia and Bismarck. Diplomacy was used to good effect to give him a free hand in the Austrian war and isolated France before the Franco-Prussian War. The use of war depended on the contributions of others and there is evidence that Bismarck was doubtful about success before the Austro-Prussian War whereas he feared that Napoleon III would be willing to negotiate before the 1870 war. His handling of the North German Confederation from 1866 and then his achievement of the unification of all Germany in 1871 can be interpreted as successful diplomacy. The new German Empire reflected Prussia's dominance. Some candidates might omit the creation of the Empire but this should not be regarded as a serious lapse. Candidates might examine his aims and consistency. How far did he wish to unify Germany and did he change? These points will be relevant but are not essential to the question.

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	13

**5 Assess the results of 'New Imperialism' for European governments in the late nineteenth century.**

The key issue is the results for governments of imperialism. Candidates can consider a range of factors but will need to link them to government, rather than explain them as general effects. Governments gained prestige and power. The best example is the British Empire but other examples that might be cited are Germany's wish for a 'place in the sun', French ambitions to compensate for the loss of prestige in the Franco-Prussian War and Italy's desire to be recognised as a major country. The complementary effect was that governments were involved in rivalries, for example Britain and France in northern Africa and Britain and Germany in south-west Africa. Several examples of imperial crises might be examined, for example Fashoda and Morocco. There were also rivalries in Asia. Candidates might consider economic effects. Colonies were seen as profitable, providing raw materials and markets. However, more critical answers might be aware of the limits of the economic gains. Raw materials were obtained but Africa and Asia did not provide large markets. The empires were also expensive to maintain and defend. Governments were exposed to the pressures of public opinion. A number of politicians were initially unconvinced by the advantages of imperialism, for example Disraeli and Bismarck, but were persuaded to go down this route because of public opinion. Disraeli made much of imperial Britain later in his career. At the same time, they often did not control the actions of 'the man on the spot' but had to react to events. Reference might be made to Cecil Rhodes and Karl Peters. Answers on imperialism often discuss Social Darwinism but, as with other factors, it will be necessary to link this to the key issue. Examiners look for supporting overseas examples. Answers without such examples might be limited to Band 4. On the other hand, examples can be brief because of the range of the topic. However, to go beyond Band 5, answers will probably need to mention specific British/European governments to support claims.

**6 Why was the revolution in February 1917 more dangerous for Nicholas II's government than the revolution in 1905?**

The key issue is the comparative importance of the 1905 and February 1917 revolutions in Russia. The comparison will be direct and evident in answers in Band 1 with a reasonable balance between 1905 and February 1917. (All candidates should note February as the end point. It is difficult to see how the October Revolution can be relevant unless mentioned very briefly in an introduction or conclusion.) For Band 5, an adequate understanding of one revolution will be required. In 1905, the opposition was limited but should not be underestimated. It included not only Father Gapon and Bloody Sunday at St. Petersburg but unrest in other cities and rural regions. The Potemkin mutiny at Odessa might be mentioned. However, the opposition in 1917 was more widespread. Perhaps crucially, the army remained loyal in 1905 but was disloyal in 1917. 1905 was partly caused by the unsuccessful war against Japan of 1904–05 but the impact of World War I was much greater. The morale of the army was shattered whilst it had devastating effects on the civilian population. In 1905, Nicholas II was popular. In 1917, he was perceived as a major problem. The Tsar's reputation declined from 1905 when he failed to implement promised reforms in the October Manifesto. The intervening period might be described as one of missed opportunities. The Duma was mistrusted and often ignored. Stolypin was given little backing and his death was not regretted by Nicholas II. (The Tsar might have been involved directly or indirectly.) By 1914, his inadequacy as a military leader exposed him to personal criticism. By 1917, he had lost almost all support, including in the highest circles which had backed him in 1905. Candidates should take care when examining the role of radicals. Lenin and his associates were not involved in 1905. He and many of his associates were in exile. Nor did the Bolsheviks play an important role in the February Revolution. Lenin stated that he did not expect a revolution.

Page 12	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	13

**7 How accurately has Hitler's government of Germany from 1933 to 1939 been described as 'totalitarian'?**

The key issue is the study of Hitler's government as totalitarian. The question asks 'Why' and answers in Bands 1 and 2 should be analytical in approach. Answers in Band 1 should attempt to explain 'totalitarian' specifically. However, examiners will note the limited study of political ideas that the syllabus requires. Others might deal with this implicitly, including assumptions that it was synonymous with political dictatorship. Totalitarian is generally used to describe a regime that tries to control all aspects of life, not only political government but also the economy, religion, thought and culture. It is commonly associated with extreme forms of propaganda and terror. Accounts that are restricted to descriptions of Hitler's one-party state might be worth Band 5 but could be worth more if well-explained. The Enabling Laws gave Hitler dictatorial powers. Other parties were suppressed. Hitler as Führer was all powerful. (Some might refer to Führer Law or the Führer Principle.) The Concordat (1933) with the Papacy went as far as he dared to control religion. (Not as far as Stalin but further than Mussolini.) The rights that were negotiated with the Roman Catholic Church were widely disregarded. An attempt was made to set up a Nazi Church but with little success. The economy was directed centrally. Private industry continued but served the interests of the state and increasingly the military demands of Hitler. Independent trade unions were suppressed and much was made of the small concessions to the workers of free holidays that camouflaged the real nature of working conditions. Nazi models dominated all forms of culture (whilst the hierarchy pilfered foreign art that was officially disapproved of). Propaganda promoted the idea of Hitler as supreme and all-powerful leader. Real or suspected critics were dealt with by the SS and Gestapo. Their courts, if used, were outside the responsibility of normal courts but even these were presided over by compliant judges. Minorities, especially the Jews, were treated harshly. Reference might be made to the Nuremberg Laws (1935) and Kristallnacht (1938).

**8 Who did more to establish communism in Russia during the period from 1917 to 1939: Lenin or Stalin?**

The key issue is the comparison of Lenin and Stalin in the establishment of communism in Russia. Answers in Bands 1 and 2 will be reasonably balanced. A split of 60:40 either way can merit any mark. Band 5 will require an understanding of either Lenin or Stalin. The comparison will be direct in Band 1 but might be implied in other Bands. However, examiners will not exclude from Band 1 answers that are sequential but well argued, as long as the comparison comes through. Answers in the two highest Bands will concentrate on the establishment of communism. Other answers might be more straightforward descriptions. The case for Lenin will probably rely heavily on his role in the October 1917 Revolution when the Bolsheviks gained power. He then transformed Russia until his death, establishing the supremacy of the communist Bolsheviks. Many of the foundations were laid then, including the murder of Nicholas II and his family which made a royalist restoration impossible, and the establishment of a one-party state. However, his work was incomplete. War Communism failed and the New Economic Policy (NEP) can be construed as a return to some non-communist practices. Stalin was more thorough, destroying any vestiges of non-communist practices, for example in the economy. The entire state, including the military and culture, followed the communist party-line. Opposition, real or imagined, was crushed. By 1939, the entire pre-revolutionary social structure had disappeared. Examiners should not underestimate well argued claims that Russia never became a communist state. Lenin combined Marxist theory with a willingness to accept compromise. Stalin might be described as setting an agenda that was more Stalinist than communist. The proletariat did not gain power. Marx did not envisage a personal dictatorship. There was no form of democracy. However, this is likely to be a minority approach.